

REMARKS

The amendments to claims 32-41 and 43-45 are to change claim dependencies and/or to bring these claims into conformity with the language of their respective base claim(s). New claim 46 is based at least on former claim 31. Particularly, Applicant notes that the claim limitations recited in new claim 46 were previously presented in the canceled claim 31. No new matter has been added.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102/103

Claims 31-33, 35, and 39-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,354,295 issued to Guglielmi et al. (Guglielmi). Claims 31 and 42 were canceled. With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully notes that in order to sustain a rejection under §102, each element in the rejected claim must be found, either expressly or inherently, in the cited reference.

New independent claim 46 recites a vaso-occlusive system having (1) a vaso-occlusive device, and (2) a retainer assembly. Guglielmi does not disclose or suggest such vaso-occlusive system. Rather, Guglielmi only discloses a vaso-occlusive device (coil 56) deliverable to within an aneurysm 64 (Figures 4 and 5). Once delivered within the aneurysm, the coil 56 assumes a random shape to substantially fill up the aneurysm. There is nothing in Guglielmi that discloses or suggests a retainer assembly that retains the coil 56 after the coil 56 has been delivered within the aneurysm. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 46 is believed allowable over Guglielmi. For at least the reasons that claim 46 is allowable over Guglielmi, the remaining claims 32-41 and 43-45, which depend from claim 46, should also be allowable over Guglielmi.

According to the Office Action, Guglielmi discloses “a retainer assembly (56/58)” and “a vaso-occlusive device 58, . . . which is a part of the retainer system”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Guglielmi only discloses a vaso-occlusive device (i.e., a coil) 56 having a tip 58 (See Column 9, lines 30-37, and figures 3-5). There is nothing in Guglielmi that discloses or suggests a retainer assembly other than the vaso-occlusive device 56. As such, claims 32-41 and 43-46 are believed allowable over Guglielmi.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: 1/12/04

By: 
Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
(650) 849-4960